DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 435 484 PS 028 070

AUTHOR	Blum, Barbara B.; Berrey, Ellen C.
TITLE	Welfare Research Perspectives: Past, Present, and Future. A View from the Research Forum on Children, Families, and the New Federalism.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, NY. National Center for Children in Poverty.
SPONS AGENCY	Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.; Russell Sage Foundation, New York, NY.; George Gund Foundation, Cleveland, OH.; Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, New York, NY.; Chase Manhattan Foundations, New York, NY.
PUB DATE	1999-08-00
NOTE	37p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Children; *Family (Sociological Unit); *Federal Legislation; Immigrants; Research Methodology; *Research Needs; *Research Problems; *Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	*Personal Responsibility and Work Opp Recon Act; *Welfare Reform

ABSTRACT

Research findings are providing increasingly valuable information about the effects of welfare changes on families receiving public assistance. This working paper outlines past and current research activities related to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA), describes research reports scheduled for future publication, and identifies questions and issues to be addressed. Following an executive summary delineating research findings most pertinent to PRWORA's objectives and identifying new research expected to yield significant findings, the paper presents information on the Forum's research clearinghouse and lists the projects described in its database. The paper gives examples of insights from research into implementation and early impact of welfare reform and identifies subgroups that are emerging within the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) population. The paper describes federally-sponsored projects on specific groups, including children and rural families. In addition, the paper identifies research needs, including increased focus on effective interventions for TANF participants who do not enter employment, who are affected by sanctions, and who are long-term "stayers." Finally, the paper identifies emerging research issues, including promoting well-designed, rigorous research; enhancing current research activities; examining specific populations; and testing special interventions. The paper concludes by noting that documented progress in research deserves recognition and that findings should be applied to public policy and practice activities. A list of welfare-related research organizations is appended. Contains approximately 300 references. (KB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 435 484

A View from the

RESEARCH FORUM ON CHILDREN, FAMILIES, AND THE NEW FEDERALISM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Welfare Research Perspectives

Past, Present, and Future

Barbara B. Blum
Ellen C. Berrey

PS 028070

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Elizabeth Siecke
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

NATIONAL CENTER FOR CHILDREN IN POVERTY
The Joseph L. Mailman School of Public Health
Columbia University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Research Forum on Children, Families, and the New Federalism

The Research Forum on Children, Families, and the New Federalism, an initiative of the National Center for Children in Poverty, was founded in January 1997, with support from the Annie E. Casey, Russell Sage, George Gund, Edna McConnell Clark, and the Chase Manhattan Foundations. The Research Forum is committed to encouraging rigorous study of issues and interventions affecting poor families; to promoting collaborative work among and between researchers, policymakers and practitioners; and to facilitating access to information that can inform policy and practice.

Research Forum Advisors

J. Lawrence Aber *National Center for Children in Poverty*
Thomas Corbett *Institute for Research on Poverty*
Susan Mayer *Joint Center for Poverty Research*
Deborah Phillips *Board on Children, Youth, and Families*
Howard Rolston *Administration for Children and Families, DHHS*
Patricia Ruggles *Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHHS*
Ann Segal *Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHHS*
Barry L. Van Lare *Welfare Information Network*

Research Forum Staff

Barbara B. Blum *Director*
Mary Clare Lennon *Director of Research*
Ellen Winn *Program Coordinator*
Alecia Hill *Research/Administrative Assistant*
Jennifer Farnsworth *Graduate Research Assistant*
Carole J. Oshinsky *Managing Editor, National Center for Children in Poverty*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Copyright © August 1999 by the National Center for Children in Poverty

Executive Summary

Research findings are providing increasingly valuable information about the effects of welfare changes on families receiving public assistance. This working paper outlines past and current research activities related to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA), and describes the proliferation of research reports scheduled for publication over the next several years. Most importantly, it identifies questions and issues still to be addressed.

Background

The enactment of the PRWORA in 1996 ended Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the federal entitlement to assistance for eligible needy families with children, and created the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant (TANF) to the states. The specified goals of TANF are to:

- Provide support to poor families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives
- Reduce the need for government benefits by promoting job readiness, work, and marriage and family guidance
- Prevent and reduce non-marital pregnancies and encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families

Under TANF, states have greater flexibility over the design and implementation of their welfare programs, but are required to impose work requirements and enforce a five-year limit on the receipt of federal assistance. PRWORA makes $16.8 billion available to states each year through 2002 to help them achieve TANF goals.

Since the passage of PRWORA, welfare programs in the United States have changed profoundly. Foremost among the changes is the dramatic and continuing reduction in the number of individuals participating in the TANF program. In 1998, three million families were receiving cash assistance from TANF, a reduction of 40 percent from the caseload of five million families receiving AFDC in 1994. Reductions in this caseload are being attributed to PRWORA-mandated changes in immigrant eligibility, movement into the work force, departures due to sanctions or time limits, and reduced entries that reflect diversion programs as well as participants' reluctance to conform to TANF mandates, particularly the work requirements. In the 1990s, a strong economy and new state waiver programs had already stimulated declining enrollment in AFDC. PRWORA's requirements, plus continued economic vitality, are sustaining these earlier trends.

Numerous research studies indicate the extent to which welfare programs have changed. Not only have cash assistance caseloads been dramatically reduced, but participation in the Food Stamp and Medicaid programs has also diminished. Congressional intent to reduce the number of low-income or poor families' receipt of government benefits has been achieved in a remarkably short period of time.

The legislative intent to promote job entry and work is also being achieved. A new report by the U.S. Government Accounting Office (GAO), *Welfare Reform: Information on Former Recipients' Status* (April 1999), and other recent studies describe significant entry to employment by former recipients of TANF.

However, while large percentages of the welfare caseload are entering employment, many issues connected to job retention and adequacy of income are emerging. At the same time, the decline in non-marital pregnancy and divorce rates—which began prior to the enactment of PRWORA—continues. Both of these trends are clearly related to PRWORA's interest in child well-being.

Prior or Current Research Findings Most Pertinent to PRWORA's Objectives

- Research and analytic studies during the 1980s indicated that (1) modest investments led to modest improvements in employment, earnings, and reduced reliance on public assistance and (2) caseload dynamics were related to levels of education and employment experience. This research identified a cohort of individuals (about 50 percent of the caseload) who moved into the work force in a relatively short time.

- Three controlled experiments: New Chance Demonstration, Teenage Parent Demonstration (TPD), and Learning, Earning, and Parenting (LEAP) Program, produced findings that delineated the difficulties of improving education, employment, income, and child bearing outcomes for young mothers.

- Carefully designed studies that track children whose parents were participants in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program (now the National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies) and in the New Chance Demonstration have produced information about the severity and prevalence of physical and developmental problems for children of teenage and other welfare mothers. These findings substantiate earlier analyses by Child Trends, which detailed the problems of poor children, particularly those in low-income working families.

- More recent research emanating from the waivers of the early 1990s produced information about the imposition of time limits and sanctions prior to PRWORA. While both the administration of and rationale propelling time limits and sanctions are often problematic for staff and welfare participants, research findings document increases in employment and reductions in caseloads at sites where time limits and sanctions were imposed.

- Several experimental programs with mandatory work requirements include income supplements in order to give a clear incentive to obtain employment and achieve self-sufficiency. While program components differed significantly, the New York Child Assistance Program (CAP), the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP), the New Hope Project, Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project, and various other programs demonstrated increases in income, reductions in poverty, and improvements in child well-being.

New Research Expected to Yield Significant Findings

- New research activity is focused on those who have left the caseloads. These "leavers" are the subject of many studies. Early findings show that entry to employment has significantly increased although the jobs these individuals attain generally pay low wages and recidivism is significant (about 20 percent).

- Child outcomes are currently the subject of evaluations in multiple states, five of which are using comparable measures. Findings from these studies will be published in 2000 and 2001. Other studies, including the Fragile Families Project and the Welfare, Children, and Families: A Multi-City Study, will also produce relevant findings.

- Welfare-to-Work programs intended to support the transition of "hard to place" TANF recipients are being evaluated and should provide valuable information during the next several years about strategies for participants who are particularly vulnerable.

- Several other research projects are focused on specific populations such as immigrants, urban and rural participants, and Native Americans in order to highlight the differential effects of PRWORA and other statutory changes.

- Ten states are designing employment retention initiatives to examine which combinations of support (e.g. Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), Food Stamps, Medicaid, and housing subsidies) may help sustain employment and reduce recidivism. Several initiatives are testing the effects of changes in transportation and housing policies and how they may advance PRWORA objectives.

Unanswered Questions and Questions Requiring More Adequate Exploration

- More research is needed to examine the impact of PRWORA and other statutory changes on immigrant families. In particular, studies focused on the degree to which the reduction of benefits, such as welfare, Medicaid, Food Stamps, and caseload reductions reflect diminishing benefits for immigrants, especially immigrant children, can help lawmakers formulate ameliorative policies.

- While research shows that child poverty cuts across all racial and ethnic boundaries in the United States, child outcome studies that target Latino and African-American children, children whose families live in urban and rural areas, and children in immigrant families are critically important.

- Further research should focus on effective interventions for those TANF participants who do not enter employment, those affected by sanctions, and those who are long-term "stayers." These studies will likely reveal a high incidence of particular disabilities including depression, developmental disabilities, and/or drug use among these specific TANF populations. Conditions such as these may respond to carefully designed interventions, which require testing.

Testimony regarding the April 1999 GAO study raised a set of related questions that should be at the core of both current and forthcoming welfare reform research. These questions include:

- How do families fare after leaving welfare to work?
- What is happening to families who sought, but were diverted from, cash or other assistance?
- How effective are states in working with welfare recipients who are difficult to employ?
- How would an economic downturn affect states' welfare reform programs?

Emerging Research Issues

In addition to expanding the topical areas for research studies, a number of research methodology issues require action. These include:

1. **Promoting well-designed, rigorous research**
   While research activities are producing a wealth of information, the quality of the studies varies considerably. Issues related to design, scale, sample size, participation and response rates, attrition, and implementation all affect the validity of each study's findings. Thus, it is exceedingly important to showcase the research that will produce the most reliable findings.

2. **Disseminating information from conferences and meetings**
   There are an increasing number of forums where respected researchers can give important presentations. In the past year, government and non-government organizations such as the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the Institute for Research on Poverty (University of Wisconsin-Madison), the Joint Center for Poverty Research (Northwestern University/University of Chicago), the National Research Council, the Welfare Reform Academy, The Urban Institute, and The Brookings Institution have hosted multiple meetings on income security research. In addition, the Annie E. Casey Foundation has supported monthly briefings for congressional staff. These and similar presentations need to be systematically summarized, so that pertinent information reaches larger audiences of researchers, policymakers, program personnel, and the media.

3. **Synthesizing findings**
   Simultaneous studies are measuring the effects of particular program components, such as time limits, financial incentives, sanctions, and school attendance requirements. Others are analyzing the impacts of different TANF programs on specific populations, such as children and welfare leavers. In addition, in every state, multiple research projects are examining aspects of the state's income security programs and policies. Synthesizing findings from these various sets of studies should be a research priority.

4. **Enhancing current research activities**
   Analytic and implementation studies require continued support in order to improve representativeness and sample size, extend the duration of the study inquiry, and

generally enhance research design. Expanding efforts to improve the quality and use of administrative data are of particular importance.

5. Examining specific populations
   Many questions about the effects of TANF on adults and their children remain unanswered. Much more information is needed about the status of those families who earn low wages or who have left public assistance without obtaining employment. Researchers need to understand how high-risk families, where the parent(s) may be depressed, developmentally disabled, or drug addicted, are faring. They will also need to examine the well-being of immigrant families, families from diverse racial and ethnic groups, families from different types of residential areas (e.g. urban, rural, and suburban), as well as welfare cases in which the child and not the parent is eligible for TANF.

6. Testing special interventions
   Based on what is being learned about specific populations, different programs need to be developed and experimentally tested in order to identify effective interventions for salient problems. For poor working families, some combination of an EITC, access to Food Stamps and Medicaid, and provision of quality child care, transportation, and housing assistance may increase stability and decrease the likelihood of recidivism that many of these families experience. For more troubled and dysfunctional families, a combination of well-designed supported work programs, and enhanced, Head Start-like child care may succeed in reducing TANF enrollment and promoting child well-being. A point has now been reached in PRWORA's implementation when testing such initiatives is timely.

Conclusion

Clearly, the next several years will produce more findings and extensive knowledge about the effects of many aspects of TANF, including financial incentives, time limits, and sanctions. Still to come will be findings about the special needs of former recipients and families leaving or diverted from TANF, immigrants, Native Americans, urban and rural participants, and public housing residents. In addition, there will be information about child outcomes and the effectiveness of job retention, welfare-to-work, and transportation interventions. These research results will be enhanced by The Rockefeller Institute's study of TANF implementation at the state level, the many statistical analyses of The Urban Institute's Assessing the New Federalism project, and the Center for Law and Social Policy's detailed descriptions of regulatory changes, as well as analytic reports from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Support for still other research activities is critical in order to address new and emerging research issues.

The documented progress in research activities is commendable and deserves recognition. Now is the time to apply what has been learned to our national and state policy and local practice activities, even as additional support is marshaled for research to enrich our understanding of America's low-income families.

Introduction

Just three years ago on August 22, 1996, the enactment of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) in 1996 ended Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the federal entitlement to assistance for eligible needy families with children, and created the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant (TANF) to the states. Specified goals of TANF include providing support to poor families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives; promoting job preparation, work, and marriage in order to reduce families' receipt of government benefits; preventing and reducing the incidence of non-marital pregnancies; and encouraging the formation and maintenance of two-parent families. States have greater flexibility over the design and implementation of their welfare programs, but are required to impose work requirements and enforce a five-year limit on the receipt of federal assistance. PRWORA makes $16.8 billion available to states each year through 2002 to help them achieve TANF goals.

Since the passage of PRWORA, welfare programs in the United States have changed profoundly. Foremost among the changes is the dramatic and continuing reduction in the number of individuals participating in the TANF program. In 1998, three million families were receiving cash assistance from TANF, a reduction of 40 percent from the caseload of five million families receiving AFDC in 1994. Changes in this caseload are attributed to movement into the work force, departures due to sanctions or time limits, and reduced entries that reflect diversion programs as well as participants' reluctance to conform to TANF mandates, particularly the work requirements. In the 1990s, a strong economy and new state waiver programs had already stimulated the declining enrollment in AFDC. PRWORA's requirements, plus continued economic strength, are sustaining these earlier trends.

Caseload reductions of similar magnitude have been experienced in the Medicaid and Food Stamp programs. TANF participants and many TANF "leavers"—those individuals who have left or been diverted from the program—are still eligible for these benefits. However, program participation in both the Medicaid and Food Stamp programs is dramatically reduced, due to changes in immigrant eligibility. In addition, there are often administrative disconnects related to the TANF statute, and many individuals are not informed that they can apply for these benefits regardless of their TANF status. While PRWORA legislation is responsible for many effects, other changes in immigration law, Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits, and health programs are also affecting TANF and low-income working families.

TANF, Medicaid, and Food Stamp reductions have produced substantial fiscal surpluses for most states, providing an opportunity to budget resources for new initiatives that can further advance the objectives of PRWORA. Recent estimates suggest that since January 1998 states have not used between $4–6 billion of available federal welfare funds. Although some states are using these federal funds to create new kinds of programs and others are saving them for use in a recession, many have not yet made innovative changes to their welfare programs.

Research in the 1970s and 1980s

Highly relevant research on work and welfare began to emerge in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s. The Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC), in a series of work and welfare experiments in eight states, produced findings showing positive but modest impacts for employment, earnings, welfare reductions, and cost benefits. In two separate supported work experiments, long-term AFDC recipients and developmentally disabled individuals experienced positive impacts. Also in the 1980s, Mary Jo Bane and David Ellwood published analyses of AFDC participants that produced new information regarding the dynamics of the AFDC caseload and identified risk factors related to prolonged welfare receipt. (See, for example, Slipping Into and Out of Poverty: The Dynamics of Spells, *Journal of Human Resources,* Winter 1986, 21(1), 1–23.)

Passage of the Family Support Act in 1988, with its emphasis on preparation for employment and its mandate (albeit modest) for participation in work-related activities, seems to have stimulated significant interest in testing new requirements and interventions at the state level. This interest led to the granting of an unprecedented number of waivers, and with each waiver approved came the requirement for well-designed research to test the waiver's effect(s). Thus, in the late 1990s, a veritable windfall of research findings from these waiver evaluations is emerging.

Other studies have already produced important and relevant information. An outstanding social policy report published by Society for Research in Child Development (SRCD) in 1998, describes basic research conducted prior to the passage of PRWORA. (See Zaslow, M., et al. Implications of the 1996 Welfare Legislation for Children: A Research Perspective. *Social Policy Report,* 1998, 12(3), 1–35.) The report points out that MDRC's New Chance Demonstration and Mathematica Policy Research's Teenage Parent Demonstration both revealed how difficult it is to affect education, employment, and earnings attainment for teen parents and how vulnerable their children are. In another study of AFDC children whose mothers participated in the Family Support Act's JOBS program, a stunning set of data shows the levels of depression and illiteracy among the AFDC mothers and the developmental lags experienced by their children. (See Moore, K. A., et al. *The JOBS Evaluation: How Well are They Faring?* MDRC for U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Education, 1996. Web: aspe.os.dhhs.gov/hsp/cyp/jobchdxs.htm)

In addition to this basic research, earlier work by Child Trends, which examined the effects of poverty on child development and family functioning, demonstrated that income makes a huge difference. (See Zill, N. et al. *The Life Circumstances and Development of Children in Welfare Families: A Profile based on National Survey Data.* Child Trends, 1991.) Several recent or current studies have produced findings about the effects of income supplements in reducing poverty. The New York Child Assistance Program (CAP) produced significant increases in income, reduced dependency on AFDC, and was cost effective. The Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP), a waiver experiment, has significantly reduced poverty through the use of a generous disregard combined with a mandate to work. Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP) is producing impressive increases in income and employment emanating from wage

supplements. In addition, recent findings from an experiment in Wisconsin called New Hope, which used job creation and fiscal incentives, are very promising. Given the role that income can play in affecting family functioning and child development, findings from these experiments should be used strategically to influence policies addressing the economic needs of poor families.

Monitoring and Supporting Welfare Research

The Research Forum on Children, Families, and the New Federalism was created in January 1997 to monitor current and future research developments and to promote additional rigorous, policy relevant research. The funders, who have included the Annie E. Casey, Chase Manhattan, Edna McConnell Clark, George Gund, and Russell Sage Foundations, have also stressed the need to encourage collaboration among researchers, policymakers, and practitioners. Located at the National Center for Children in Poverty at Columbia University's Joseph L. Mailman School of Public Health, the Research Forum actively promotes these goals.

A significant project at the Research Forum involves developing and maintaining a research clearinghouse, housed in a database and accessible through an interactive web site (www.researchforum.org). This initiative has enabled staff to disseminate information about research activities related to PRWORA and devolution to a wide range of audiences.

The clearinghouse features extensive information about 43 research projects (as of July 1999) that are: (1) relevant to TANF, (2) large-scale, and (3) designed by well-recognized social scientists. Twenty-six of these projects have impact studies, 21 of which are controlled experiments. Also included are implementation studies (some of which relate to the impact research), child outcomes studies embedded in larger impact studies, and policy analyses. Many other research studies are also underway. Seventy-one smaller-scale, TANF-related projects are summarized on the web site, as well. All of these projects can be searched by the program component, activity, or policy being evaluated (e.g., time limits, sanctions, financial incentives), the populations being studied (e.g. children), the type of research study (e.g. implementation analysis), and many other variables.

For example, a database search for the geographical sites under study reveals that the distribution of active research projects roughly correlates with TANF caseloads (see Figure 1). Of the 114 projects in the Research Forum database in July 1999, 33 include California as a study site. Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, and Ohio also have a high volume of research activity. Fewer research projects are being conducted in states that are smaller or have fewer TANF recipients. For instance, there are only nine welfare reform studies in Rhode Island, Idaho, and New Hampshire.

Figure 1: Projects in Research Forum Database as of July 1999

	Reviewed*	Unreviewed**	Total
ALABAMA	☆☆☆★★★	★★★★★	11
ALASKA	★★★	☆☆★★★★★	10
ARIZONA	☆☆☆☆★★★	☆☆☆★★★★★	15
ARKANSAS	☆☆★★★	☆☆★★★★★	12
CALIFORNIA	☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆★★★★★	33
COLORADO	☆☆☆★★★	☆★★★★★	12
CONNECTICUT	☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆★★★★★	14
DELAWARE	☆☆☆★★★	★★★★★	11
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	★★★	☆★★★★★	9
FLORIDA	☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆★★★★★	18
GEORGIA	☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆☆★★★★★	14
HAWAII	☆★★★	★★★★★	9
IDAHO	☆★★★	★★★★★	9
ILLINOIS	☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆☆☆☆★★★★★	19
INDIANA	☆☆☆★★★	★★★★★	11
IOWA	☆☆☆★★★	★★★★★	11
KANSAS	☆☆★★★	★★★★★	10
KENTUCKY	☆☆★★★	☆☆★★★★★	12
LOUISIANA	☆☆★★★	☆☆★★★★★	12
MAINE	☆★★★	★★★★★	9
MARYLAND	☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆★★★★★	14
MASSACHUSETTS	☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆☆☆☆★★★★★	21
MICHIGAN	☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆☆☆☆★★★★★	20
MINNESOTA	☆☆☆☆☆★★★	★★★★★	13
MISSISSIPPI	☆☆★★★	☆★★★★★	11
MISSOURI	☆★★★	☆★★★★★	10
MONTANA	☆★★★	★★★★★	9
NEBRASKA	☆★★★	☆★★★★★	10
NEVADA	☆★★★	☆★★★★★	10
NEW HAMPSHIRE	☆★★★	★★★★★	9
NEW JERSEY	☆☆☆☆★★★	☆★★★★★	13
NEW MEXICO	☆★★★	☆★★★★★	10
NEW YORK	☆☆☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆☆☆☆☆☆★★★★★	21
NORTH CAROLINA	☆☆☆★★★	★★★★★	11
NORTH DAKOTA	☆☆★★★	★★★★★	10
OHIO	☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆☆☆★★★★★	20
OKLAHOMA	☆☆★★★	★★★★★	10
OREGON	☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆☆★★★★★	15
PENNSYLVANIA	☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆☆★★★★★	15
RHODE ISLAND	☆★★★	★★★★★	9
SOUTH CAROLINA	☆★★★	☆☆☆★★★★★	12
SOUTH DAKOTA	☆★★★	☆★★★★★	10
TENNESSEE	☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆★★★★★	14
TEXAS	☆☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆☆☆★★★★★	17
UTAH	☆☆★★★	★★★★★	10
VERMONT	☆☆★★★	★★★★★	10
VIRGINIA	☆☆★★★	☆★★★★★	11
WASHINGTON	☆☆☆★★★	☆☆☆☆★★★★★	15
WEST VIRGINIA	☆☆★★★	★★★★★	10
WISCONSIN	☆☆☆☆☆★★★	☆☆☆☆☆☆☆★★★★★	20
WYOMING	☆★★★	★★★★★	9
CANADA	☆☆	0	2
TOTAL	43	71	

☆ State is a primary site for project

★ Project is studying all 50 states

* Reviewed Research Project. Projects selected according to specific criteria defined by Research Forum staff. Reviewed Project Summaries are prepared by Research Forum staff using a standardized protocol and, except where noted otherwise, approved by an appropriate project contact person.

** Unreviewed Research Project. Projects that either were entered by web site users using the Add A Project Form or did not meet the Research Forums criteria for Reviewed Projects. A subset of these projects will be considered for detailed review if they are large-scale or multi-site and conducted by organizations with experience relevant to the income security/TANF domain.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Certain research projects are focusing closely on, and producing reports about issues of particular salience. (See Appendix 1 for the full name and address of the research organizations listed below.) These include:

Child Outcomes

• Assessing the Effects of Welfare Reform on California's Most Precarious Families	CSSR at Berkeley
• Child Welfare in a CalWORKS Environment	CSSR at Berkeley
• Connecticut's Jobs First: Welfare Reform Evaluation Project	MDRC
• Florida Family Transition Program (FTP) Evaluation	MDRC
• Fragile Families Project	Columbia U
• Georgia Welfare Reform Impact Assessment	GA DHR
• Growing Up in Poverty Project (Formerly Devolution of Welfare: Assessing Children's Changing Environments and Effects on School Readiness)	Yale
• Health Effects of Welfare Reform on Children with Chronic Illness	Boston Medical Ctr.
• Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation	Abt
• Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation	Mathematica
• Los Angeles Survey of Families and Communities	RAND
• Michigan Assemblies Project	GJW
• Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) Evaluation	MDRC
• Monitoring Child and Family Social Program Outcomes: Before and After Welfare Reform in Four States	Chapin Hall
• National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies (formerly JOBS)	MDRC
• New Chance Demonstration	MDRC
• New Hope Project	MDRC
• New Immigrant Survey	New York U
• Preschool Immunization Project Evaluation	Abt
• Project for the Improvement of Child Support Litigation Technology	PICSLT
• Rural Impacts of Welfare Reform	U Wisconsin
• Survey of Program Dynamics	Census Bureau
• Teenage Parent Demonstration (TPD)	Mathematica
• Welfare, Children, and Families: A Multi-City Study	Johns Hopkins

Teen Parent Interventions

• Learning, Earning, and Parenting (LEAP) Program	MDRC
• New Chance Demonstration	MDRC
• Teenage Parent Demonstration (TPD)	Mathematica

Financial Incentives

• Alabama Avenues to Self-Sufficiency Through Employment and Training Services (ASSETS) Demonstration	Abt
• Arizona Employing and Moving People Off Welfare and Encouraging Responsibility (EMPOWER) Welfare Reform Demonstration	Abt
• Arkansas Transitional Employment Assistance (TEA) Program	BPA
• Assessing Effective Welfare-to-Work Strategies for Domestic Violence Victims and Survivors in the Options/Opciones Project	Taylor
• Assessing the New Federalism	Urban Inst.
• Budgetary and Spending Implications of a Food Stamp Outreach Program	ECONorthwest
• California Works Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS) Program Statewide Evaluation	RAND
• Canada's Earnings Supplement Project (ESP) Evaluation	SRDC
• Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP) Evaluation	SRDC
• CASAWORKS for Families	TRI
• Comparing Recent Declines in Oregon's Cash Assistance Caseload with Trends in the Poverty Population	OCPP
• Comprehensive Evaluation of Welfare Reform in New York State	To be selected
• Confronting the New Politics of Child and Family Policy in the U.S.	Columbia SSW
• Connecticut's Job First Program	MDRC
• Delaware's A Better Chance (ABC) Evaluation	Abt
• Florida Family Transition Program (FTP) Evaluation	MDRC
• Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) Evaluation	MDRC
• Implementing Welfare Reform Requirements for Teenage Parents: Lessons from Experience in Four States	Mathematica
• Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation	Abt
• Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation	Mathematica
• JOBS-PLUS Community Revitalization Initiative for Public Housing Families	MDRC
• Learning, Earning, and Parenting (LEAP) Program	MDRC
• Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) Evaluation	MDRC
• Monitoring States' Welfare Reforms	GAO
• National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies (formerly JOBS)	MDRC
• Nebraska Employment First Program Evaluation	NE DHS
• Nevada Welfare Reform Evaluation	NV SWD
• New Hope Project	MDRC
• New York Child Assistance Program (CAP) Evaluation	Abt
• North Dakota Training, Education, Employment, and Management (TEEM) Project Evaluation	BPA
• Parents' Fair Share Demonstration	MDRC

• Pennsylvania TANF Closed Case Telephone Survey	PA DPW
• Postemployment Services Demonstration	Mathematica
• Project on Devolution and Urban Change (SPDP)	MDRC
• Rural Impacts of Welfare Reform	U Wisconsin
• Rural Welfare Reform Project: Does Welfare Reform Work in Rural America?	Ohio U
• State Policy Documentation Project	CLASP
• Survey of Program Dynamics	Census Bureau
• Texas Achieving Changes for Texans (ACT) Welfare Reform Waiver Evaluation	U Texas
• Three States' Approaches Show Promise of Increasing Work Participation	GAO
• To Strengthen Michigan's Families (TSMF) Evaluation	Abt
• Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project Evaluation	MDRC
• Welfare, Children, and Families: A Multi-City Study	Johns Hopkins

Time Limits

• Arizona Employing and Moving People Off Welfare and Encouraging Responsibility (EMPOWER) Welfare Reform Demonstration	Abt
• Arizona TANF Cash Exit Study	AZ DEC
• Assessing the Effects of Welfare Reform on California's Most Precarious Families	CSSR at Berkeley
• Assessing the New Federalism	Urban Inst.
• Big Cities Confront the New Politics of Child and Family Policy	Columbia SSW
• California Works Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS) Program Statewide Evaluation	RAND
• Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP) Evaluation	SRDC
• CASAWORKS for Families	TRI
• Comprehensive Evaluation of Welfare Reform in New York State	To be selected
• Confronting the New Politics of Child and Family Policy in the U.S.	Columbia SSW
• Connecticut's Jobs First: Welfare Reform Evaluation Project	MDRC
• Delaware's A Better Chance (ABC) Evaluation	Abt
• Devolution, Welfare Reform, and Wellbeing Study	Columbia SSW
• Florida Family Transition Program (FTP) Evaluation	MDRC
• Food Stamp Leavers in South Carolina	SC DSS
• Fragile Families Project	Columbia U
• Georgia Welfare Reform Impact Assessment	GA DHR
• Health Effects of Welfare Reform on Children with Chronic Illness	Boston Medical Ctr.
• Immigrant Women and Welfare Project	ERA
• Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation	Abt
• Michigan Assemblies Project	GJW

• Monitoring States' Welfare Reforms	GAO
• Nebraska Employment First Program Evaluation	NE DHS
• Nevada Welfare Reform Evaluation	NV SWD
• North Dakota Training Education, Employment, and Management (TEEM) Project Evaluation	BPA
• Project on Devolution and Urban Change	MDRC
• Rural Impacts of Welfare Reform	U Wisconsin
• Rural Welfare Reform Project: Does Welfare Reform Work in Rural America?	Ohio U
• South Carolina: State Welfare Reform Evaluation Program	SC DSS
• State Policies and Practices Regarding Substance Abuse, Medicaid, and the Employment Needs of Welfare Recipients	CASA
• State Policy Documentation Project	CLASP
• Survey of Former Family Independence Program Clients	SC DSS
• Survey of Program Dynamics	Census Bureau
• Texas Achieving Change for Texans (ACT) Welfare Reform Waiver Evaluation	U Texas
• Texas Child Care Utilization and Outcomes Study	U Texas
• The Welfare in Transition Project: Consequences for Women, Families and Communities	RPPI
• Three States' Approaches Show Promise of Increasing Work Participation	GAO
• Tracking Closed Cases Under the TANF Program in Massachusetts	MA DTA
• Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project Evaluation	MDRC
• Welfare, Children, and Families: A Multi-City Study	Johns Hopkins
• Welfare Reform Commission's Longitudinal Database Study	MA DOR
• Welfare Reform: States Early Experiences with Benefit Termination	GAO
• Welfare to Work: Monitoring the Impact of Welfare on American Indian Families	GWBSSW, Wash U

Researchers have already produced syntheses of findings from some of these studies. In November 1997, the Research Forum and the National Center for Children in Poverty (NCCP), along with the Joint Center for Poverty Research (JCPR), Mathematica, and MDRC, hosted a conference that synthesized findings of the three teen parent program evaluations. And, in an October 1997 publication from The Cross-State Study of Time-Limited Welfare, MDRC researchers summarized pertinent findings from studies in Connecticut, Florida, and Wisconsin. (See Brown, A., Bloom, D., & Butler, D. *The View From the Field: As Time Limits Approach, Welfare Recipients and Staff Talk About Their Attitudes and Expectations*. MDRC, 1997.)

Welfare Program Insights from Research Reports

Each project summary in the Research Forum database highlights the major findings from recently published study reports and provides a list of the research reports expected in the future. During 1998 alone, 82 study reports were published. Between January 1999 and late 2001, at least 123 reports will be released by approximately 40 research projects (see Appendix 2). Many interim reports have been released in the past year, providing valuable insights into the implementation and early impacts of welfare reform under PRWORA. For example:

- The New Hope Project reported increased employment and earnings, leading in turn to increased income during the first year of follow-up and enabling more low-income workers to earn their way out of poverty. The New Hope Project's effects on employment and income, coupled with its provisions of health insurance and child care subsidies, set off a chain of beneficial effects for participants' families and their children.
- Postemployment Services Demonstration findings showed little or no impacts from a case management model implemented in multiple sites.
- Eighteen-month findings from Social Research and Demonstration Corporation's evaluation of the Canada Self-Sufficiency Project demonstrate that financial incentives, such as wage subsidies, can increase employment, earnings, and family income.
- In January 1999, Abt Associates, Inc. released interim impact analyses of the financial penalties in Delaware's A Better Chance program. Of the 16,602 families enrolled by June 1998, 43 percent had been sanctioned. Clients often had difficulty understanding and complying with the rules. These and other factors, rather than clients' motivation to work, were strongly associated with sanction receipt.
- Parents' Fair Share Demonstration targets noncustodial parents (primarily fathers) of children receiving welfare. MDRC's interim impact findings show no increase in employment and earnings, although child support payments from some parents had increased. The report documents the importance of distinguishing between fathers who are unwilling to pay child support and those who are unable to pay.

Two major national research efforts have recently released reports. One paints a picture of life for low-income families; the other describes the implementation of welfare and social programs designed to serve them. In January 1999, the Assessing the New Federalism Project of The Urban Institute released its first report using the National Survey of America's Families (NSAF), a data set of over 44,000 households that over-samples poor families. The report, *Snapshots of America's Families: A View of the Nation and 13 States from the National Survey of America's Families*, describes how children in low-income households experience greater hardships with regard to health care, parental employment, social engagement, and child development in comparison to those in households with higher incomes.

The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government is currently studying the implementation of changes in national welfare and related policies in 20 states. Researchers are also reviewing ground-level operations of welfare programs in 12 local sites. *Implementing the Personal Responsibility Act of 1996: A First Look*, published in early February 1999, discusses the influence of political and economic signals emanating from policy changes, the significant transformations within welfare bureaucracies, and the new configurations of responsibility and power over welfare programs.

Studies Point to Subgroups within TANF Caseloads

Research findings have identified some of the subgroups that are emerging within the TANF eligible population. There are TANF participants who are establishing ties to the work force and there are participants for whom movement into employment is proving more difficult, even in locales where the economy is strong. In this latter group, TANF participants may be severely depressed, victims of domestic violence, addicted to drugs, or functioning at a mildly retarded level. Even in the group connecting to work, some individuals with limited education and/or work experience are likely to require supports to ensure stability in their new jobs. There is a third group about whom little is known. These are the individuals who leave or are diverted from TANF, but do not enter employment. Finally, there are child-only cases, cases in which the child, but not the parent, is TANF eligible. These cases are a growing proportion of the shrinking caseload.

An important set of questions, then, relates to what has been learned from research about effective interventions for both marginally prepared job entrants and for individuals with severe emotional or mental problems. Another set of questions concerns the ways in which specific subgroups are affected by time limits, work requirements, sanctions, and other TANF mandates imposed by the states. These provisions will impact a range of populations, including TANF recipients in welfare-to-work and employment retention programs, Native Americans and Alaska Natives, families in rural areas, immigrants, and members of different racial and ethnic groups, in addition to the subgroups identified above. Policymakers also need to understand how TANF provisions affect families in programs such as Food Stamps, Medicaid, and public assisted housing.

Federally-Sponsored Research on Specific Groups

Several federal agencies have recently launched research projects to measure the effects of welfare reform on different populations. These projects will complement existing studies and further enhance the knowledge base. The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) and the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), are responsible for coordinating the implementation of PRWORA. These agencies have initiated a series of studies that are clustered around specific topics relevant to welfare reform. To facilitate comparisons of findings across sites, the projects employ similar research questions and data collection methods. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Department of Labor (DOL), Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and other federal agencies are also engaged in research activities. Funding for many of the projects is drawn from the $5 million provided by Congress in 1998 to study welfare reform. States, localities, and private foundations are providing additional resources for these studies, as well. Figure 2 shows the federally funded sites and studies.

Figure 2: States Studied in Recent Federally Funded Research Projects

	Child Outcomes	Child Indicators[1]	Welfare Leavers	Welfare-to-Work[2]	Tribal Welfare-to-Work[2]	Rural Welfare-to-Work	Employment Retention[3]	Immigrants	Food Stamp Leavers	Transportation	Public Housing and Welfare Leavers
ALABAMA											
ALASKA		★									
ARIZONA			★					★			
ARKANSAS											
CALIFORNIA		★	★				★	★			★
COLORADO									★		
CONNECTICUT	★										
DELAWARE		★									
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			★								
FLORIDA	★	★	★								
GEORGIA		★	★								
HAWAII		★									
IDAHO											
ILLINOIS			★			★	★		★	★	
INDIANA	★										
IOWA	★					★			★		
KANSAS											
KENTUCKY											
LOUISIANA						★					
MAINE		★									
MARYLAND		★				★	★			★	
MASSACHUSETTS			★								★
MICHIGAN											
MINNESOTA	★	★				★					
MISSISSIPPI						★					
MISSOURI			★			★				★	
MONTANA											
NEBRASKA											
NEVADA											
NEW HAMPSHIRE											
NEW JERSEY							★				
NEW MEXICO											
NEW YORK		★	★			★		★			
NORTH CAROLINA							★				
NORTH DAKOTA											
OHIO			★				★				
OKLAHOMA											
OREGON											
PENNSYLVANIA											
RHODE ISLAND		★					★				
SOUTH CAROLINA			★				★		★		
SOUTH DAKOTA											
TENNESSEE							★				
TEXAS							★				
UTAH		★									
VERMONT		★				★					
VIRGINIA							★				
WASHINGTON			★			★	★				
WEST VIRGINIA		★									
WISCONSIN			★				★			★	
WYOMING											
Total Number of Projects	5	14	14	TBD	8–10	10	13	2	4	5	3

★ One or more research projects examining one or more sites in that state

[1] States receiving technical assistance funding

[2] States included in research project to be determined (TBD)

[3] States receiving planning grants. States included in research evaluation to be determined

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Child Outcomes and Indicators

Children are a majority of the TANF caseload, and current program changes will affect children both directly, through provisions like immunization requirements, and indirectly, through parental provisions like employment requirements. While some welfare evaluations include child outcome measures, most generally focus on adult outcomes. Child outcome data, when collected, often do not provide in-depth, comparable information. In order to understand how welfare changes are influencing children, appropriate and consistent measures of child well-being and development need to be collected at the state level.

Currently, ACF and ASPE are sponsoring The Project on State-Level Child Outcomes, enabling five states to augment their welfare waiver evaluations with comparable child outcome measures. The evaluations are being conducted by MDRC in Connecticut, Florida, and Minnesota, by Abt in Indiana, and by Mathematica in Iowa. The first of the final reports on child outcomes, from the Minnesota waiver experiment, is scheduled for release in January 2000. Final reports from the four other projects are expected in February 2000 (FL), April 2000 (IO), December 2000 (IN), and September 2001 (CT). ACF and ASPE are also working with these and other states to identify a core set of child outcome measures and to incorporate these measures into their data collection systems. Child Trends is leading this effort, which includes researchers who participate in the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development's Research Network on Family and Child Well-Being.

ACF contact: *Alan Yaffee, (202) 401-4537, ayaffee@acf.dhhs.gov*

ASPE contact: *Martha Moorehouse, (202) 690-6939, mmoorehó@osaspe.dhhs.gov (e-mail preferred)*

Child Trends contacts: *Kristin Moore, Martha Zaslow, Kathryn Tout (202) 362-5580, ktout@childtrends.org*

To advance state initiatives around child indicators, ASPE, along with ACF, has awarded grants to 14 states. This project aims to help states develop child health and well-being indicators and institutionalize the use of these data in state and local policy activities. The Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago is organizing technical assistance and coordinating collaboration between states, researchers, policy experts, and federal staff. Each state will release its own project report.

ASPE contacts: *Jody McCoy (202) 690-7477, childind@osaspe.dhhs.gov; Martha Moorehouse (202) 690-6939, mmoorehó@osaspe.dhhs.gov (e-mail preferred)*

Chapin Hall contact: *Mairead Reidy (773) 753-2596, REIDY-MAIREAD@chc-smtp.spc.uchicago.edu*

Project summaries and state contacts web site: *aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/cyp/cindicators.htm*

Welfare "Leavers"

As states begin to implement time limits and diversion programs, questions about what happens to families who leave or are diverted from TANF have become particularly salient. Until recently, few research projects have studied leavers from welfare programs over time. In September 1998, ASPE awarded approximately $2.9 million to 13 grantees to examine outcomes for welfare leavers. This amount constitutes the major portion of the funds authorized by Congress for welfare research. ASPE and ACF are monitoring the grantees' activities.

The definition of a "leaver" varies across projects. The studies all focus on families that no longer receive TANF benefits; three also look at parents whose children remain on welfare. The cause for leaving may be an increase in earnings, a sanction, the end of a time limit, or a reason not recorded or directly cited by the recipient. Researchers may also study those who: (1) are diverted through a formal diversion program, (2) are eligible but discouraged from applying because of program rules and requirements, (3) apply but are financially ineligible or fail to complete the application process, (4) appear to be eligible but are not enrolled, and/or (5) withdraw voluntarily. Each project is following at least two cohorts, although the cohorts may be from different time periods.

Thus far, researchers have reached consensus on at least one major issue: the individual or family is considered a leaver if they have spent at least two months off of cash assistance. Consistent definitions need to be developed and used for each topic, group, or outcome in order to produce information that is comparable across states.

The evaluators are using linked administrative data, survey data, or a combination, although there are differences in survey designs and data sets. The projects share some research questions. All of the grantees are exploring income supports, health insurance, child care, reasons for case closures, and barriers to self-sufficiency such as domestic violence, substance abuse, depression, and lack of transportation. Many will also delve into topics such as employment and earnings, child well-being, attitudes towards TANF and work, and changes in household composition since leaving TANF. Several of the studies look at the use of Food Stamps, Medicaid, General Assistance, SSI, and other public assistance programs. Interim reports from the states are anticipated in 1999. Final reports are expected between December 1999 and December 2001.

Project summaries web site: *aspe.os.dhhs.gov/hsp/isp/98grants.htm*

In addition to DHHS, numerous organizations are compiling information about leaver studies. The Research Forum's database includes summaries of research on leavers, including many of the DHHS-funded studies. In May 1999, the U.S. Government Accounting Office (GAO) issued a report reviewing various welfare leavers studies. In early 2000, GAO also plans to publish a report on welfare sanctions that will address some related issues, such as diversion. The National Conference of State Legislators and the National Governors' Association are compiling and promoting research on the DHHS-funded and other state studies examining welfare leavers.

Welfare-to-Work Programs

PRWORA, reflecting a shift in philosophy from education and training to "work first," stipulates that only limited periods of time in certain activities can count towards federal requirements for work participation. For instance, job searches are restricted to six weeks per individual, although 12 weeks are allowed in states with high unemployment. The law places even greater limits on basic and post-secondary education. If states are to fulfill their TANF obligations and assist recipients in moving into the labor force, they will need to develop highly effective job training and placement strategies.

In the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA), Congress authorized $3 billion in welfare-to-work (WtW) grants to help the hardest-to-serve TANF recipients and certain non-custodial parents of children on TANF get and keep jobs. At least 70 percent of the funds must be spent on the "hardest-to-employ" individuals—primarily long-term TANF recipients with substance abuse problems, low levels of education and basic skills, and/or poor work histories.

The law also stipulated an evaluation of WtW programs. DHHS, with DOL and HUD, has designed an evaluation that includes a descriptive assessment of WtW grantees, as well as impact, cost-effectiveness, and implementation studies. DHHS is now in the process of identifying in-depth study sites. Mathematica, the evaluator, and The Urban Institute and Support Services International, Inc. (SSI), the subcontractors, are scheduled to complete an early implementation report to Congress in 1999. Reports to Congress on program impacts of WtW services are due in fall 2001 and again in 2002.

ASPE project contacts: *Alana Landey (202) 401-6636, alandey@osaspe.dhhs.gov*

Mathematica contact: *Alan M. Hershey (609) 275-2384, ahershey@mathematica-mpr.com*

Evaluation description web site: *www.doleta.gov/wtweval/evalsum.htm*

Tribal Welfare-to-Work Programs

The PRWORA and BBA also made unique provisions so that Native American and Alaska Native tribal organizations could develop and operate WtW programs. Five new programs now provide tribal governments with resources and flexibility to promote employment and establish time limits and work requirements for tribal nations.

As part of its congressionally mandated WtW evaluation, DHHS is also conducting a distinct study of tribal WtW programs. SSI, a Native American-owned research firm that has extensive experience with reservation evaluations, is leading this study. Mathematica and The Urban Institute will also be involved. An advisory group of about 10 representatives who are from American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) groups and have relevant expertise will provide evaluation assistance. The researchers will focus on the program models developed, the activities and services emphasized, and the approaches used to integrate services. SSI is currently choosing 8–10 research sites. Findings will be included in the January 2001 report to Congress.

ASPE project contact: *Alana Landey (202) 401-6636, alandey@osaspe.dhhs.gov*

SSI contact: *Walter Hillabrant (301) 587-9000, access@iamdigex.net*

Mathematica contact: *Alan M. Hershey (609) 275-2384, ahershey@mathematica-mpr.com*

Evaluation description web site: *www.doleta.gov/wtweval/tribevalsum.htm*

Rural Welfare-to-Work

Families who receive welfare benefits and live in rural areas represent approximately 20 percent of all recipients. States face unique challenges to creating jobs that are accessible to this population. Rural economies have a limited capacity to absorb large numbers of individuals into the work force. Many of these recipients have low education levels and lack access to transportation and affordable, safe child care. To support information sharing and research about effective rural WtW approaches, the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE), ACF, DHHS is providing the federal dollars for ten 17-month planning grants. The research topics range from rural transportation in Iowa to the barriers to self-sufficiency—both actual and perceived—faced by TANF recipients in Missouri. The grantees will produce semi-annual progress reports and a final report by June 2000.

OPRE contact: *James Dolson (202) 260-6165, jdolson@acf.dhhs.gov (e-mail preferred)*

Employment Retention

Welfare recipients who find employment usually work in service sector positions that are entry level and either temporary or part-time. These low-wage jobs rarely include benefits or opportunities for career advancement. In order to leave welfare, move out of poverty, and progress in the labor market, these individuals will need assistance in sustaining and improving the quality of their jobs.

ACF has allocated resources for a multi-site, random assignment evaluation of the most promising employment retention and advancement strategies. Thirteen states have received planning grants from the agency to refine their programs and prepare for possible participation in the evaluation. In late 1999, all states will have the opportunity to submit proposals for participation. The Lewin Group, with its subcontractor The Johns Hopkins University, is assisting states in these activities. ACF plans to choose the evaluator in 1999, and by spring 2000, select approximately 10 states for the five-year study. Profiles of the state programs and early implementation findings are expected by the end of 2000, and interim impact findings in 2002.

ACF contacts: *Nancye Campbell (202) 401-5760, ncampbell@acf.dhhs.gov; Mark Fucello, mfucello@acf.dhhs.gov; Ken Maniha (202) 401-5372, jmaniha@acf.dhhs.gov*

Lewin Group contact: *Michael Fishman (703) 269-5655, mfishman@lewin.com*
Project description web site: www.lewin.com/

Immigrants

Since 1996, welfare and immigration legislation has changed legal and illegal immigrants' eligibility for federal programs, dramatically reducing their access to Medicaid, SSI, Food Stamps, and non-cash services. The potential impacts on child well-being are significant. Twenty percent of children under age 18 living in the United States—approximately 14 million children—are immigrants or have immigrant parents.

DHHS (ASPE, ACF, and the Health Care Financing Administration), the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and USDA (the Food and Nutrition Service, and the Economic Research Service) are funding a major study: Welfare Reform, the Economic and Health Status of Immigrants, and the Organizations that Serve Them. The Urban Institute, the grantee, is looking at immigrants' health, employment, economic hardship, and participation in government programs in New York and Los Angeles. The project also explores how cuts in food stamps and changes in immigration policies are affecting immigrants and the organizations and agencies that serve them. Researchers are currently conducting surveys and interviews with immigrants and community organizations and analyzing administrative and other relevant data sets.

On March 9, 1999, The Urban Institute released an interim analysis of immigrant outcomes, using data from the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS findings basically replicate at a national level what was documented in an earlier study of Los Angeles County. For example, the researchers found that between 1994 and 1997, use of public benefits among non-citizen households with children fell more sharply (35 percent) than use among citizen households with children (14 percent). Additional interim reports may be published before release of the final report, due October 2000.

ASPE contact: *David Nielsen (202) 401-6642, dnielsen@osaspe.dhhs.gov*

Urban Institute contacts: *Michael Fix, mfix@ui.urban.org; Leighton Ku, lku@ui.urban.org*

Project description web site: *www.urban.org/centers/ps_welfare.html*

Food Stamp Leavers

The 1996 welfare law mandated changes in food nutrition programs, most notably a scaling back of the Food Stamp Program. In the past three years, participation in the Food Stamp Program has declined considerably—approximately 28 percent between December 1995 and December 1998. Four studies in Arizona, Illinois, Iowa, and South Carolina are currently examining the status of households and individuals that leave the Food Stamp Program. The South Carolina project expands upon a welfare leavers' study. The projects all pay close attention to able-bodied adults ages 18–50 without dependents, who are now subject to time limits if they do not meet specific work requirements. Researchers are using administrative records and surveys to analyze employment, support from earnings and income, and support from public/private programs. Final reports will be released in winter 2000 (AZ), spring 2000 (IL), and fall 2000 (IA and SC).

Economic Research Service contact: *Thomas Carlin (202) 694-5406, tcarlin@econ.ag.gov*

Project description web site: *www.econ.ag.gov/briefing/foodasst/*

Transportation

Transportation to and from work is a primary obstacle for low-income workers. Two-thirds of new jobs are created in the suburbs, but three-fourths of welfare recipients live in either inner city or rural areas. Bridges to Work, a large-scale demonstration, supports organizations that are helping "ready to work" urban residents, including some TANF recipients, find and keep jobs in the suburbs. The program assists with transportation needs, as well as job placement and retention, in Baltimore, Chicago, Denver, Milwaukee, and St. Louis. Public/Private Ventures (P/PV), the contractor, is conducting evaluations in four of the cities to test if improved access to suburban jobs can significantly improve outcomes for low-income workers and their urban neighborhoods. HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R), with the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Transit Administration, is furnishing the federal funds. A descriptive report is due in 1999.

HUD contact: *James Hoben (202) 708-0574, james_e._hoben@hud.gov*

P/PV: *Joseph Tierney (215) 557-4453, jtierney@ppv.org*

Project description web site: *tap.epn.org/ppv/b_to_w.html*

Public Housing Assistance

Welfare reform will affect not only TANF recipients, but also public housing residents, agencies, and policies. In late 1996, approximately one million families—nearly half of the families who received housing assistance—were also receiving some AFDC/TANF benefits.

The new 1999 Welfare-to-Work Voucher Program, created by the President and Congress, enables families to use vouchers to subsidize rent for apartments in areas with better job opportunities or transportation systems. In April 1999, public housing agencies, along with the agencies and local entities receiving DOL welfare-to-work grants (described above), submitted applications to participate in the voucher competition. HUD will monitor the program and develop formal evaluation plans.

HUD contact: *Kevin Neary (202) 708-3700, kevin_j._neary@hud.gov*

HUD's PD&R is supporting three "add-ons" to the DHHS-funded welfare leavers projects to explore questions related to public assisted housing. The grantees in Massachusetts, Los Angeles County, and the consortium of three Northern California counties (San Mateo, Santa Cruz, and Santa Clara) will compare the outcomes of families who leave welfare with families that are assisted and not assisted by HUD. Final reports will be published in late 2001, although dates vary for each project.

Grantees, contacts, and project summaries web site: *www.huduser.org/research/policy.html*

Emerging Research Issues

Clearly, an impressive volume of research is underway and is identifying key, emerging research issues. These include the need for:

1. **Promoting well-designed, rigorous research**
   While research activities are producing a wealth of information, the quality of the studies varies considerably. Issues related to design, scale, participation and response rates, attrition, and implementation all affect the validity of each study's findings. Thus, it is exceedingly important to showcase the research that will produce the most reliable findings.

2. **Disseminating information from conferences and meetings**
   There are increasing numbers of forums where respected researchers give important presentations. In the past year, government and non-government organizations such as the United States Department of Health and Human Services, the Institute for Research on Poverty (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Joint Center for Poverty Research (Northwestern University/University of Chicago), National Research Council, the Welfare Reform Academy, The Urban Institute, and The Brookings Institution have hosted multiple meetings on income security research. In addition, the Annie E. Casey Foundation has supported monthly briefings for Congressional staff. Presentations such as these need to be systematically summarized, so that pertinent information reaches larger audiences of researchers, policymakers, practitioners, and the media.

3. **Synthesizing findings**
   Multiple studies are measuring the effects of particular program components, such as time limits, financial incentives, sanctions, and school attendance requirements. Others are analyzing the impacts of different TANF programs on specific populations, such as children and welfare leavers. In addition, in every state, research projects are examining aspects of the state's income security programs and policies. Syntheses of findings from these various sets of studies should be a research priority.

4. **Enhancing current research activities**
   Analytic and implementation studies require continued support in order to improve representativeness and sample size, extend the duration of the study inquiry, and generally enhance research design. Expanding initiatives to improve the quality and use of administrative data are of particular importance.

5. **Examining specific populations**
   Many questions about the effects of TANF on adults and their children remain unanswered. Much more information is needed about the status of those who have become low-income working families or have left public assistance without entering employment. Researchers need to understand how dysfunctional families—where the parent(s) may be depressed, developmentally disabled, or drug addicted—are faring. They will also need to examine the well-being of immigrant families and families from

diverse racial and ethnic groups, as well as welfare cases in which the child and not the parent is TANF eligible.

6. **Testing special interventions**
   Based on what is being learned about specific populations, different programs need to be developed and tested in order to identify salient problems and effective interventions. For poor working families, some combination of an Earned Income Tax Credit, access to Food Stamps and Medicaid, and provision of quality child care, transportation, and housing assistance may lessen stress and the likelihood of recidivism that many of these families experience. For more troubled and dysfunctional families, a combination of well-designed supported work, and enhanced, Head Start-like child care may succeed in reducing TANF enrollment. A point has now been reached in PRWORA's implementation when testing such initiatives is timely.

Conclusion

Clearly, the next several years will produce a proliferation of reports and extensive knowledge about the effects of many aspects of TANF, including financial incentives, time limits, and sanctions. Still to come will be findings about the special needs of former recipients and families leaving or diverted from TANF, immigrants, Native Americans, rural participants, and public housing residents. Information about child outcomes and job retention, welfare-to-work, and transportation interventions can also be expected. These research results will be enhanced by The Rockefeller Institute's study of TANF implementation at the state level, the many analyses of The Urban Institute's Assessing the New Federalism Project, and the Center for Law and Social Policy's detailed descriptions of regulatory changes, as well as analytic reports from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Support for still other research activities is critical, in order to address the new, emerging research issues. The Research Forum on Children, Families, and the New Federalism at the National Center for Children in Poverty will continue to monitor and share findings from these and other studies on its web site and in future publications.

The documented progress in research activities is commendable and deserves recognition. Now is the time to apply what has been learned to our national and state policy and our local practice activities, even as additional support is marshaled for research to enrich our understanding of low-income families.

APPENDIX 1

Welfare-Related Research Organizations

Abt Associates Inc. (Abt)
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138-1168
Telephone: (617) 492-7100
Fax: (617) 492-5219
Web site: http://www.abtassoc.com

The Arizona Department of Economic Security (ADEC)
P.O. Box 6123
Site Code 080A
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Telephone: (602) 229-2766
Fax: (602) 254-3074
Web site: http://www.de.state.az.us/index.html

Boston Medical Center (Boston Medical Ctr.)
Division of General Pediatrics
One Boston Medical Center Place
Boston, MA 02118
Telephone: (617) 414-7911
Fax: (617) 414-4092
Web site: http://www.bmc.org

Berkeley Planning Associates (BPA)
440 Grand Avenue, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94610-5085
Telephone: (510) 465-7884
Fax: (510) 465-7885
Web site: http://www.bpacal.com

Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy
Yale University (Yale)
310 Prospect Street
New Haven, CT 06511
Telephone: (203) 432-9944
Fax: (203) 432-9945
Web site: http://www.yale.edu/bushcenter/

Center for Health Policy Research (CHPR)
The George Washington University
2021 K Street, NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 296-6922
Fax: (202) 296-0025
Web site: http://www.gwumc.edu/chpr/frame.htm

Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP)
1616 P Street, NW, Suite 150
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 328-5140
Fax: (202) 328-5195
Web site: http://www.clasp.org

Center for Social Services Research (CSSR at Berkeley)
University of California, Berkeley
16 Haviland Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-7400
Telephone: (510) 642-1899
Fax: (510) 642-1895
Web site: http://cssr21.socwel.berkeley.edu:80/

Chapin Hall Center for Children (Chapin Hall)
University of Chicago
1313 East 60th Street
Chicago, IL 60637
Telephone: (773) 753-5900
Fax: (773) 753-5940
Web site: http://www.chapin.uchicago.edu/

Center for Young Children and Families
Columbia University (Columbia U)
Teachers College
Box 39, 254 Thorndike Hall
525 West 120th Street
New York, NY 10027
Telephone: (212) 678-3904
Fax: (212) 678-3676
Web site: http://www.tc.columbia.edu/academic/eycf/

Columbia University School of Social Work
(Columbia SSW)
706 McVickar Hall
Mail Code 4600
New York, NY 10025
Telephone: (212) 854-3048
Fax: (212) 854-4320
Web site: http://www.columbia.edu/cu/ssw/

Equal Rights Advocates (ERA)
1663 Mission Street, Suite 550
San Francisco, CA 94103
Telephone: (415) 621-0672
Fax: (415) 621-6744
Web site: http://www.equalrights.org

Georgia Department of Human Resources (GA DHR)
2 Peachtree Street, NW
Atlanta, GA 30303-3142
Telephone: (404) 657-5700
Fax: (404) 657-5708
Web site: http://www2.state.ga.us/Departments/DHR/

Groundwork for a Just World (GJW)
11224 Kercheval Street
Detroit, MI 48214-3323
Telephone: (313) 822-2055
Fax: (313) 822-5197
E-mail: groundwork@aol.com

Institute for Research on Poverty (IRP)
University of Wisconsin-Madison
1180 Observatory Drive
3412 Social Science Building
Madison, WI 53706
Telephone: (608) 262-6358
Fax: (608) 265-3119
Web site: http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp/

Johns Hopkins University (Johns Hopkins)
Department of Sociology
Mergenthaler Hall
3400 North Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218-2687
Telephone: (410) 516-7626
Fax: (410) 516-7590
Web site: http://www.jhu.edu/~welfare/

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC)
16 East 34th Street
New York, NY 10016-4326
Telephone: (212) 532-3200
Fax: (212) 684-0832
Web site: http://www.mdrc.org

Massachusetts Department of Revenue (MA DOR)
200 Arlington Street
Chelsea, MA 02150
Telephone: (617) 577-7200
Fax: (617) 887-6141
Web site: http://www.state.ma.us/dor/Dor.htm

Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance (MA DTA)
1 Ashburton Place, Room 1109
Boston, MA 02108
Telephone: (617) 348-8526
Fax: (617) 348-8575
Web site: http://www.state.ma.us/eohhs/eohhs.htm

Mathematica Policy Research Inc. (Mathematica)
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
Telephone: (609) 799-3535
Fax: (609) 799-0005
Web site: http://www.mathematica-mpr.com

National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA)
152 West 57th Street
New York, NY 10019-3310
Telephone: (212) 841-5200
Fax: (212) 956-8020
Web site: http://www.casacolumbia.org

Nebraska Health and Human Services System (NE DHHS)
Office of Economic Assistance
P.O. Box 95044
Lincoln, NE 68509-5044
Telephone: (402) 471-9325
Web site: http://www.hhs.state.ne.us/

Nevada State Welfare Division (NV SWD)
Nevada Department of Human Resources
2527 North Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89710
Telephone: (775) 687-4128
Fax: (775) 687-5080
Web site: http://www.state.nv.us/hr/

New York University (New York U)
Department of Sociology
269 Mercer Street
New York, NY 10003
Telephone: (212) 998-8340
Fax: (212) 995-4140
Web site: http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/socio/

Ohio University (Ohio U)
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
George V. Voinovich Center for Leadership & Public Affairs
286 Lindley Hall
Athens, OH 45701
Telephone: (740) 593-1381
Fax: (740) 593-1365
Web site: http://www.-as.phy.ohiou.edu/Departments/SocAnth/

Oregon Center for Public Policy (OCPP and ECONorthwest)
204 North First Street, Suite C
P.O. Box 7
Silverton, OR 97381-0007
Telephone: (503) 873-1201
Fax: (503) 873-1947
Web site: http://www.ocpp.org

Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare (PA DPW)
Box 2675
333 Health & Welfare Building
Harrisburg, PA 17105
Telephone: (717) 787-4592
Fax: (717) 772-2062
Web site: http://www.state.pa.us/PA_Exec/Public_Welfare/overview.html

Radcliffe Public Policy Institute (RPPI)
69 Brattle Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Telephone: (617) 496-3478
Fax: (617) 496-2982
Web site: http://www.radcliffe.edu/pubpol/index.html

RAND (RAND)
P.O. Box 2138
Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138
Telephone: (310) 393-0411
Fax: (310) 393-4818
Web site: http://www.rand.org

Social Research and Demonstration Corporation (SRDC)
250 Albert Street, Suite 625
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1P 6M1
Telephone: (613) 237-5039
Fax: (613) 237-5045
Web site: http://www.srdc.org

South Carolina Department of Social Services (SC DSS)
Office of Program Reform, Evaluation and Research
P.O. Box 1520
Columbia, MD 29202
Telephone: (803) 898-7461
Fax: (803) 898-7671
Web site: http://dss.state.sc.us

Taylor Institute (Taylor)
915 North Wilcott
Chicago, IL 60622
Telephone: (773) 342-5510
Fax: (773) 342-4532

Treatment Research Institute, Inc. (TRI)
2005 Market St. Suite 1120
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 665-2880
Fax: (215) 665-2864

University of Wisconsin (U Wisconsin)
Department of Rural Sociology
1450 Linden Drive
Madison, WI 53706
Telephone: (608) 263-2897
Fax: (608) 262-6022
Web site: http://www.wisc.edu/ruralsoc/

University of Texas at Austin (U Texas)
Center for the Study of Human Resources
3001 Lake Austin Boulevard, Suite 3.200
Austin, TX 78703-4204
Telephone: (512) 471-7891
Fax: (512) 471-0585
Web site: http://uts.cc.utexas.edu/~cshr/

The Urban Institute (Urban Inst.)
2100 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
Telephone: (202) 833-7200
Fax: (202) 261-5687
Web site: http://www.urban.org

U.S. Bureau of the Census (Census Bureau)
4700 Silver Hill Road, Room 3179
Washington, DC 20233
Telephone: (301) 457-3286
Fax: (301) 457-3248
Web site: http://www.bls.census.gov/spd/spdmain.htm

U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO)
441 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20548
Telephone: (202) 512-7125
Fax: (202) 512-6061
Web site: http://www.gao.gov

Washington University, George Warren Brown School of Social Work (GWBSSW, Wash U)
Campus Box 1196
One Brookings Drive
St. Louis, MO 63130-4899
Telephone: (314) 935-4878
Fax: (314) 935-8511
Web site: http://www.gwbweb.wustl.edu/

APPENDIX 2

Welfare Research Publications, 1998–2001

A: Research Publications Released in 1998

Reviewed* Project Publications

Florida Family Transition Program Evaluation: Project on State-Level Child Outcomes [1/98]

Minnesota's Family Investment Program Evaluation: Project on State-Level Child Outcomes [1/98]

Connecticut's Job First Evaluation: Project on State-Level Child Outcomes [1/98]

Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation: Project on State-Level Child Outcomes [1/98]

Iowa's Limited Benefit Plan Evaluation: Project on State-Level Child Outcomes [1/98]

State Policy Documentation Project: State Time Limit Policies. CLASP Update [1/98]

Postemployment Services Demonstration: The Effectiveness of the Postemployment Services Demonstration: Preliminary Findings [1/98]

Teenage Parent Demonstration Program: Moving Into Adulthood: Were the Impacts of Mandatory Programs for Welfare-Dependent Teenage Parents Sustained After the Programs Ended? [2/98]

Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project: Do Work Incentives Have Unintended Consequences? Measuring the "Entry Effects" in the Self-Sufficiency Project [3/98]

Florida Family Transition Program Evaluation: Implementation and Interim Impacts of Florida's Initial Time-Limited Welfare Program [3/98]

CASAWORKS for Families: A Proposal for Phase One of a Two-Phase Study of an Integrated Service Delivery and Treatment Model for Substance Abusing Welfare Mothers and their Children [3/98]

New Chance Demonstration: Parenting Behavior in a Sample of Young Mothers in Poverty: Results of the New Chance Observational Study [4/98]

Assessing the New Federalism: Effects of Welfare Reform on Unemployment Insurance (No. A-22) [5/98]

National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies: Implementation, Participation Patterns, Costs, and Two-Year Impacts of the Portland (Oregon) Welfare-to-Work Program [5/98]

Jobs-Plus Evaluation: A Research Framework for Evaluating Jobs-Plus, a Saturation and Place-Based Employment Initiative for Public Housing Residents [5/98]

Parents' Fair Share Demonstration: Working with Low-Income Cases: Lessons for the Child Support Enforcement System from Parents' Fair Share [5/98]

State Policy Documentation Project: State TANF Policies: Housing and Utility Vendor Payments. CLASP Update [5/98]

Big Cities Confront the New Polities of Child and Family Policy: Big Cities in the Welfare Transition [5/98]

Assessing the New Federalism: One Year After Federal Welfare Reform: A Description of State Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Decisions as of October 1997 [5/98]

Postemployment Services Demonstration: Keeping Welfare Recipients Employed: A Guide for States Designing Job Retention Services [6/98]

Assessing the New Federalism: Income Support and Social Services for Low-Income People in California [6/98]

Assessing the New Federalism: Adopting and Adapting Managed Care for Medicaid Beneficiaries: An Imperfect Translation [6/98]

New Chance Demonstration: Promises to Keep: Assessing Affective and Behavioral Qualities of Mother-Child Relationships in the New Chance Observational Study [6/98]

Assessing the New Federalism: Welfare Reform and Children: Potential Implications (No. A-23) [6/98]

Teenage Parent Demonstration Program: Teenage Parent Programs: A Synthesis [6/98]

Welfare Reform and Children: A Multi-City Study: What Welfare Recipients and the Fathers of Their Children Are Saying About Welfare Reform [6/98]

Iowa's Limited Benefit Plan Evaluation: A Study of Well-Being: Visits to Families on Iowa's Limited Benefit Plan [6/98]

LEAP Evaluation: Teenage Parent Programs: A Synthesis [6/98]

New Chance Demonstration: Teenage Parent Programs: A Synthesis [6/98]

* Reviewed Research Project: Projects selected according to specific criteria defined by Research Forum staff. Reviewed Project Summaries are prepared by Research Forum staff using a standardized protocol and, except where noted otherwise, approved by an appropriate project contact person.

State Capacity Study: Gaining Cooperation at the Front Lines of Service Delivery: Issues for the Implementation of Welfare Reform [6/98]

Monitoring States' Welfare Reforms: Welfare Reform: States are Restructuring Programs to Reduce Welfare Dependence [6/98]

Postemployment Services Demonstration: Ancillary Services to Support Welfare to Work [6/98]

North Dakota Training, Education, Employment, and Management (TEEM): Project Narrative [7/98]

North Dakota Training, Education, Employment, and Management (TEEM): Interim Implementation Report [7/98]

Assessing the New Federalism: Does Work Pay? An Analysis of the Work Incentives under TANF [7/98]

New Hope Project: An Early Look at Community Service Jobs in the New Hope Demonstration [7/98]

Connecticut's Jobs First Evaluation: Early Implementation of Connecticut's Welfare Reform Initiative [7/98]

Assessing the New Federalism: Job Prospects for Welfare Recipients: Employers Speak Out [8/98]

GAIN Evaluation: The Los Angeles Jobs-First GAIN Evaluation: Preliminary Findings on Participation Patterns and First-Year Impacts [8/98]

Assessing the New Federalism: Childbearing by Teens: Links to Welfare Reform [8/98]

Examination of State Diversion Programs and Activities Under Section 1115 AFDC Demonstration and TANF: Description and Assessment of State Approaches to Diversion Programs and Activities [8/98]

Postemployment Services Demonstration: Employment Experiences of Welfare Recipients Who Find Jobs: Is Targeting Possible? [8/98]

Connecticut's Jobs First Evaluation: Connecticut Post-Time Limit Tracking Study: Three Month Survey Results [9/98]

New Chance Demonstration: Moving Teenage Parents in Self-Sufficiency: Lessons from Recent Demonstrations [9/98]

Teenage Parent Demonstration Program: Moving Teenage Parents in Self-Sufficiency: Lessons from Recent Demonstrations [9/98]

Assessing the New Federalism: Child Care Assistance Under Welfare Reform: Early Responses from the States [9/98]

LEAP Evaluation: Moving Teenage Parents in Self-Sufficiency: Lessons from Recent Demonstrations [9/98]

State Capacity Study: Implementation of the Personal Responsibility Act of 1996 [10/98]

State Capacity Study: Overview Report on Welfare Reform in 20 States [10/98]

State Capacity Study: Medicaid Reform and Its Relation to Welfare Reform in West Virginia [10/98]

State Capacity Study: State Management Systems for Welfare Reform: Complexity, Second Order Devolution, and the Problems of Administration and Accountability [10/98]

Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project Evaluation: Implementation and Early Impacts of Vermont's Welfare Restructuring Project [10/98]

Assessing the New Federalism: The Welfare-to-Work Grants Program: A New Link in the Welfare Reform Chain (No. A-26) [10/98]

Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation: Program Implementation and Economic Impacts After Two Years [11/98]

Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project: When Financial Incentives Encourage Work: Complete 18-Month Findings from the Self-Sufficiency Project [11/98]

Minnesota's Family Investment Program Evaluation: Impact Update [11/98]

Assessing the New Federalism: Portrait of the Safety Net: The Market, Policy Environment, and Safety Net Response [12/98]

Assessing the New Federalism: Cash Assistance in Transition: The Story of 13 States [12/98]

CASAWORKS for Families: Family Works: Substance Abuse Treatment and Welfare Reform [12/98]

Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation: Two-Year Impacts [12/98]

Parents' Fair Share Demonstration: Building Opportunities, Enforcing Obligations: Implementation and Interim Impacts of Parents' Fair Share [12/98]

Unreviewed** Project Publications

Finding Common Ground: Welfare Reform and Women's Health [1/98]

Maximizing Job Opportunities for Welfare Recipients: Deconstructing Commitment to Work and Family in a Welfare Reliant Population [1/98]

Kentucky Welfare Reform Evaluation: From Welfare to Work: Welfare Reform in Kentucky, Welfare Reform Evaluation No. 1 [1/98]

Implementing Welfare to Work in Michigan: Moving Toward a Vision of Family Independence: Local Managers' Views of Michigan's Welfare Reforms [2/98]

** Unreviewed Research Project: Projects that either were entered by web site users using the Add A Project Form or did not meet the Research Forum's criteria for Reviewed Projects. A subset of these projects will be considered for detailed review if they are large-scale or multi-site and conducted by organizations with experience relevant to the income security/TANF domain.

Survey of Former Family Independence Program Clients: Cases Closed During January Through March, 1997 [3/98]

Survey of Welfare Recipients Employed or Sanctioned for Non-Compliance: Project Summary [3/98]

Washington State's Families After Welfare: A Baseline Analysis of TANF One-Parent Families [3/98]

Project for the Improvement of Child Support Litigation Technology: The Child Support Guideline Problem [5/98]

Project for the Improvement of Child Support Litigation Technology: Recommendations for Modification of Child Support Guidelines and Reform of their Use [6/98]

Federal Funding Impact Study: Focus Group Report [7/98]

Federal Funding Impact Study: Devolving Responsibility Report [7/98]

Federal Funding Impact Study: The Status of 122 Nonprofit Social Service Agencies in the St. Louis Region [7/98]

The W-2 Job Path: An Assessment of the Employment Trajectory of W-2 Participants in Milwaukee [7/98]

Federal Funding Impact Study: Decreasing Federal Support for Public Assistance and Social Services: National Trends and Implications for the St. Louis Region [7/98]

Survey of Program Dynamics: Measuring the Impact of Welfare Reform with the Survey of Program Dynamics [8/98]

Survey of Program Dynamics: Sample Design, Weighting, and Attrition Issues [8/98]

Survey of Program Dynamics: Developing the Survey of Program Dynamics Survey Instruments [8/98]

Leaving Welfare: Findings from a Survey of Former New York City Welfare Recipients [9/98]

Michigan Assemblies Project: How Families are Faring in Michigan's Local Communities. Findings and Recommendations of the Michigan Assemblies Project [10/98]

Child Support Data Analysis Project: You Get What You Pay For: How Federal and State Investment Decisions Affect Child Support [12/98]

B: Research Publications Scheduled for 1999

Reviewed* Project Publications

Examination of State Diversion Programs and Activities Under Section 1115 AFDC Demonstration and TANF: Diversion as a Work-Oriented Welfare Strategy and its Effects on Access to Medicaid [1/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Welfare and Immigration Reforms: The Rx May Have Unintended Side Effects for Medicaid [1/99]

Fragile Families Project: Project Description [1/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: State Responses to Recent Changes in Federal Medicaid DSH Policies [1/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reform Act and Children: Implications of Previous Research [1/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Income Support and Social Services for Low-Income People In Michigan [1/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Tracking the Well-Being of Children within the States: The Emerging Federal Role in the Age of Devolution [1/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Transformations in Public Health Systems [1/99]

A Better Chance Evaluation: Carrying and Using the Stick: Financial Incentives in Delaware's A Better Chance Program [1/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: A Different Kind of New Federalism? The Federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 [1/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Health Policy for Low-Income People In New Jersey [1/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Health Policy for Low-Income People In Alabama [1/99]

What Happens to Families Who Leave AFDC? Post-Exit Earnings and Benefit Receipt Among Those Who Left AFDC in Wisconsin [1/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Publicly Subsidized Health Insurance Programs: A Typology of Approaches in 13 States [1/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Children's Health Insurance Programs: Where States Are and Where Are They Headed [1/99]

State Capacity Study: Implementing the Personal Responsibility Act of 1996: A First Look [1/99]

Connecticut's Jobs First Evaluation: Connecticut Post-Time Limit Tracking Study: Six-Month Survey Results [1/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Medicaid Managed Care: Variations in State Approaches [1/99]

Finding Common Ground: What's a Mother to do? Welfare, Work, and Family [1/99]

* Reviewed Research Project: Projects selected according to specific criteria defined by Research Forum staff. Reviewed Project Summaries are prepared by Research Forum staff using a standardized protocol and, except where noted otherwise, approved by an appropriate project contact person.

A Better Chance Evaluation: Enrollment of Families in Delaware's A Better Chance: First Three Years [1/99]

Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation: Cost-Benefit Analysis of Iowa's Family Investment Program: Two-Year Results [2/99]

Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation: A Process Study of the Program's First Two-Years [2/99]

Devolution, Welfare Reform, and Wellbeing Study: New York City Social Indicators 1997: A Tale of Many Cities [2/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: National Survey of America's Families: Snapshots of America's Families [2/99]

State Capacity Study: Managing Welfare Reform: Updates from Field Research in Five States [3/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Child Support Enforcement is Working Better than We Think [3/99]

A Better Chance Evaluation: A Better Chance for Welfare Recipients? What the Public Thinks [3/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Does Work Pay? A Summary of the Work Incentives under TANF [3/99]

State Policy Documentation Project: Findings on Reproductive Health and TANF/Teens and TANF from 50-State Survey on Policies [3/99]

Monitoring States' Welfare Reforms: Organization of States' Employment and Training Assistance to TANF Clients [3/99]

Devolution, Welfare Reform, and Wellbeing Study: Interim Findings [3/99]

New Hope Project: New Hope for People with Low Incomes: Two-Year Results of a Program to Reduce Poverty and Reform Welfare [4/99]

State Capacity Study: Is There a Link Between Welfare Reform and Teenage Pregnancy? [4/99]

Growing Up in Poverty Project: Who Selects Formal Child Care? [4/99]

Project on Devolution and Urban Change: Big Cities and Welfare Reform: Early Implementation/Ethnographic Findings [4/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: State General Assistance Programs 1998 [4/99]

Jobs-Plus Evaluation: Overview of the Demonstration and Observations from the Field [4/99]

Parents' Fair Share Demonstration: Monograph on Qualitative Research: The Lives of the Noncustodial Parents [4/99]

Parents' Fair Share Demonstration: Report on Qualitative Research Findings [4/99]

Jobs-Plus Evaluation: Overview [4/99]

Monitoring States' Welfare Reforms: Review of Existing Studies of Recipients Who Leave Welfare [4/99]

Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation: Process/Implementation Report [4/99]

Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation: Report on Federal Cost Neutrality [4/99]

Monitoring Child and Family Social Program Outcomes: Report [4/99]

A Better Chance Evaluation: Carrying and Using the Stick: Financial Sanctions in Delaware's A Better Chance Program [5/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Where Are They Now? What States' Studies of People Who Left Welfare Tell Us [5/99]

National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies: Two-Year Impacts on Families with Young Children [5/99]

State Capacity Study: Texas' Challenge for Welfare Reform [5/99]

State Capacity Study: Fiscal Accountability and Welfare Reform [5/99]

State Capacity Study: Arizona's Welfare Reform Experiment [5/99]

State Capacity Study: Midwestern Report on Welfare Reform [5/99]

National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies: Evaluating Alternative Welfare-to-Work Approaches: Two-Year Impacts for 11 Programs (7 Sites) [5/99]

National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies: Implementation, Participation, Costs, and Impacts of the Oklahoma Welfare-to-Work Program [5/99]

National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies: Implementation, Participation, Costs, and Impacts of the Detroit Welfare-to-Work Program [5/99]

Preschool Immunization Project: Final Report [5/99]

State Capacity Study: Contracting Out for Welfare Services in New Jersey [5/99]

Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation: Three-year Impact Findings [5/99]

State Policy Documentation Project: Results from Second Surveys on Medicaid and TANF [5/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Block Granting Welfare: Fiscal Impact on the States [6/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Immigrants Under Welfare Reform [6/99]

Welfare Reform, Barriers to Employment and Family Functioning: Barriers to the Employment of Welfare Recipients [6/99]

GAIN Evaluation: The Los Angeles Jobs-First GAIN Evaluation: First-Year Findings on Participation Patterns and Impacts [6/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: How Well Can Urban Labor Markets Absorb Welfare Recipients? [6/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: State Child Welfare Spending at a Glance: A Supplemental Report to the Cost of Protecting Vulnerable Children [6/99]

Florida Family Transition Program Evaluation: Implementation and Three-Year Impacts of Florida's Initial Time-Limited Welfare Program [6/99]

Devolution, Welfare Reform, and Wellbeing Study: Analysis of Welfare Recipients and Welfare Eligibles Not Receiving Benefits [6/99]

Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project: 30 Month Data Report on Applicants [6/99]

Arizona EMPOWER Welfare Reform Demonstration: Impact Study Interim Report [6/99]

Jobs-Plus Evaluation: Early Lessons [6/99]

Postemployment Services Demonstration: Final Report [6/99]

Arizona EMPOWER Welfare Reform Demonstration: Process Study Interim Report [6/99]

Monitoring States' Welfare Reforms: Impact of Welfare Reform on Funding of States' Child Support Enforcement Program [6/99]

Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project: Report on SSP Plus [6/99]

Monitoring States' Welfare Reforms: Medicaid Enrollment After Welfare Reform [6/99]

Iowa's Limited Benefit Plan Evaluation: Study of Repeat Assignments to Iowa's Limited Benefit Plan [6/99]

Arizona EMPOWER Welfare Reform Demonstration: Nonexperimental Analysis First Interim Report [6/99]

Arizona EMPOWER Welfare Reform Demonstration: Impact Study Interim Report [6/99]

Arizona EMPOWER Welfare Reform Demonstration: Process Study Interim Report [6/99]

Assessing the New Federalism: Families Who Left Welfare: Who Are They and How Are They Doing? [7/99]

State Capacity Study: Citizen's Monitoring States' Welfare Reforms: State Use of Simplified Program [7/99]

Monitoring States' Welfare Reforms: Changes in Food Stamp Participation [7/99]

A Better Chance Evaluation: Turning the Corner: ABC at Four Years [8/99]

Jobs-Plus Evaluation: Early Lessons on Collaboration [8/99]

A Better Chance Evaluation: Do Welfare Recipients' Children Have a School Attendance Problem? [8/99]

State Policy Documentation Project: Results from Third Surveys on Medicaid and TANF [8/99]

Connecticut's Jobs First Evaluation: Interim Report [8/99]

National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies: Implementation, Participation Patterns, and Costs for Columbus [8/99]

Canada's Earnings Supplement Project: 36-Month Impacts [9/99]

National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies: Adult Education and 2-Year Educational Impacts [9/99]

Canada's Earnings Supplement Project: Child Outcome Report [9/99]

Project on Devolution and Urban Change: Working Paper on Cross-Site Institutional/Ethnographic Studies [10/99]

State Policy Documentation Project: Data from Final Survey on TANF Policies [10/99]

Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation: Child Impact Report [10/99]

Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation: Final (5 Year) Impact Findings [11/99]

Arizona EMPOWER Welfare Reform Demonstration: REDESIGN Implementation Report [12/99]

Connecticut's Jobs First Evaluation: Progress Report [12/99]

Connecticut's Jobs First Evaluation: Child Impact Study Report [12/99]

Arizona EMPOWER Welfare Reform Demonstration: Cost-Benefit Analysis Final Report [12/99]

Unreviewed** Project Publications

Maximizing Job Opportunities for Welfare Recipients: Work Opportunities in a Nontraditional Setting for Women Exiting Welfare [1/99]

What Happens to Families Who Leave AFDC? Post-Exit Earnings and Benefit Receipt Among Those Who Left AFDC in Wisconsin [1/99]

Child Support Data Analysis Project: State Child Support Cooperation and Good Cause: A Look at State Policies [5/99]

Arkansas TEA Program Evaluation: Final Report [6/99]

Finding Common Ground: Do Welfare Reform Policies Affect Reproductive and Children's Health? How Would We Know? [8/99]

** Unreviewed Research Project: Projects that either were entered by web site users using the Add A Project Form or did not meet the Research Forum's criteria for Reviewed Projects. A subset of these projects will be considered for detailed review if they are large-scale or multi-site and conducted by organizations with experience relevant to the income security/TANF domain.

C: Research Publications Scheduled for 2000/2001

Reviewed* Project Publications

Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project: Three Year Findings [1/00]

Minnesota's Family Investment Program Evaluation: Final Report [1/00]

Minnesota's Family Investment Program Evaluation: Child Impact Study Report [1/00]

Canada's Earnings Supplement Project: Child Outcomes Report Using 3 Year Findings [2/00]

Florida Family Transition Program Evaluation: Child Impact Study Report [2/00]

Florida Family Transition Program Evaluation: Final Report on Four-Year Impacts [2/00]

Project on Devolution and Urban Change: Report on Cross-State Findings on Health [3/00]

North Dakota Training, Education, Employment, and Management (TEEM): Final Report [4/00]

Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation: Final Child Impact Report [6/00]

Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project Evaluation: Progress Report [6/00]

Parents' Fair Share Demonstration: Final Report [6/00]

Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation: Final Impact Report [6/00]

Connecticut's Jobs First Evaluation: Progress Report [12/00]

Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation: Final Child Impact Report [12/00]

Connecticut's Jobs First Evaluation: Final Report [9/01]

Connecticut's Jobs First Evaluation: Final Child Impact Study Report [9/01]

Canada's Earnings Supplement Project: Child Outcomes Report [12/01]

Arizona EMPOWER Welfare Reform Demonstration: Process Study Final Report [12/01]

Arizona EMPOWER Welfare Reform Demonstration: Impact Study Final Report [12/01]

Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project: Canada SSP Final Report: 54-month Impacts and Cost/Benefit Findings [12/01]

* Reviewed Research Project: Projects selected according to specific criteria defined by Research Forum staff. Reviewed Project Summaries are prepared by Research Forum staff using a standardized protocol and, except where noted otherwise, approved by an appropriate project contact person.